



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,244	06/28/2001	Sreeram Duvvuru	5681-90800	9154
58467	7590	06/02/2009	EXAMINER	
MHKKG/SUN			CHANKONG, DOHM	
P.O. BOX 398				
AUSTIN, TX 78767			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2452	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/02/2009	ELECTRONIC	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[patent\\_docketing@intprop.com](mailto:patent_docketing@intprop.com)  
[ptomhkg@gmail.com](mailto:ptomhkg@gmail.com)

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/896,244	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DUVVURU, SREERAM
	<b>Examiner</b> DOHM CHANKONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s).Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s).Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 20 are amended. Claims 1-27 are presented for further examination.
  
2. This action is a non-final rejection.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/11/2009 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18-20, 22, 23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel et al, U.S. Patent No. 6.865.185 ["Patel"], in view of Crosbie, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0035699.

6. All citations are to Patel unless otherwise noted.

7. As to claim 1, Patel as modified by Crosbie discloses a computer-implemented method for providing differentiated quality of service in an application server, comprising:

    a server system receiving a request [Figure 1 | column 12 «lines 6-10»], wherein said request includes information indicating a current user role [*Crosbie*, 0043-0045: utilizing user ID to identify users that belong to different clusters (history or engineering students)]; and

    in response to receiving the request:

        accessing pre-determined policy data [column 3 «line 62» to column 4 «line 2» | column 7 «lines 20-26» : inserting labels that indicate FEC where the FEC identifies QoS/policy parameters | column 13 «lines 46-61» : policy base maintaining QoS policies subscribed to by the end user];

        establishing a quality of service context based on said information included in said request and said policy data [column 7 «lines 60-65» | column 12 «lines 6-11» : inserting labels that identify QoS into the packet based on the user identifier | *Crosbie*, 0045: specifying a bandwidth allocation on the WLAN depending on the user's role as either a history or engineering student]; and

propagating said quality of service context with said request in the server system, wherein said propagating comprises sending data indicating the quality of service context with the request [column 3 «line 62» to column 4 «line 2»].

As noted above, Patel does not disclose receiving a request that includes information indicating at least one of a current user role. However, including such information in user requests within a QoS system was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention as evidenced by Crosbie. Like Patel, Crosbie is directed to a providing certain QoS levels over an end-to-end connection [0016: "user service level"]. However, Crosbie further discloses including within a service request information indicating a current user role.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Patel's service requests to include information indicating a current user role as taught by Crosbie. Such a modification is an example of using a known technique (including a current user role in service requests) to improve similar systems (both Patel and Crosbie are directed to QoS systems) in the same way (Crosbie teaches that including a user's role in his service request allows the system to distinguish users based on their specific roles, 0014, 0043). *See MPEP §2143.*

8. As to claim 2, Patel as modified by Crosbie discloses said information further indicates at least one of a user identity [Figure 1 | column 12 «lines 6-10» : each packet containing a flow identifier that indicates a user identity], a requested service, or a time constraint.

9. As to claim 4, Patel as modified by Crosbie discloses said establishing a quality of service context is completed at an ingress point [column 6 «lines 39-42»].

10. As to claim 5, Patel as modified by Crosbie discloses said ingress point is at least one of a web server or a protocol manager service within said server system [column 6 «lines 42-44»].

11. As to claim 7, Patel as modified by Crosbie discloses propagating includes inserting said quality of service context adjacent to at least one of a security and transaction context [Figure 3 «item 60» : inserting the labels in the header of the packet adjacent to transaction contexts].

12. As to claim 9, Patel as modified by Crosbie discloses a request manager service dispatching said request including said quality of service context to a software component in a plurality of software components based on said quality of service context [Figure 3 «items 32, 36» : the flow manager dispatching packets to various virtual groups based on the QoS context].

13. As to claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 18, they are merely directed to a computer-readable storage medium directed to performing the steps of the method of claims 1-5, 7, and 9, respectively. Therefore claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 18 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9.

14. As to claims 11 and 20, they are merely directed to a system that performs the steps of the method of claim 2. Therefore claims 11 and 20 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 2.

15. As to claims 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 27, they are merely directed to a system that performs the steps of the method of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9, respectively. Therefore claims 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 27 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 9.

16. Claims 3, 12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel and Crosbie, in further view of Ayyagari et al, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0024434 [“Ayyagari”].

17. As to claims 3, 12, and 21, Patel as modified by Crosbie and Ayyagari discloses said quality of service context includes information indicating a service class [column 8 «lines 26-28»] and a deadline [*Ayyagari*, 0006: execution of a desired task in a specified time period | 0048: time constraint].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Patel to include the deadline feature taught by Ayyagari. Such a modification is an example of using a known technique (including information indicating a deadline for executing a task) to improve similar systems (both Patel and Ayyagari are directed to QoS systems) in the same way (Ayyagari discloses that deadlines in requests are necessary to indicate a “specified time period” for the execution of a desired task). *See MPEP §2143.*

18. Claims 6, 15, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel and Crosbie, in view of Zara et al, U.S. Patent No. 7.206.848 [“Zara”].

19. As to claim 6, Patel as modified by Crosbie does not expressly disclose propagating the same quality of service context with a subsequent request. However, such a feature was well known in the art at the time of Applicant’s invention. For example, Zara discloses attaching the same quality of service context (“tag”) with a subsequent request related to the first request [column 7 «lines 58-61»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Patel to include Zara’s teachings. One would have been motivated to include the same tag in subsequent requests to insure that the requests involved in the same session or transaction receive the QoS.

20. As to claims 15 and 24, they are merely directed to a system that performs the steps of the method of claim 6. Therefore claims 15 and 24 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 6.

21. Claims 8, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel and Crosbie, in view of Vange, U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020059170.

22. As to claim 8, while Patel discloses dispatching requests including a quality of service context, Patel does not expressly disclose a load balancing service that dispatches the requests to

an application server. However, such a feature was well known in the art at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Vange discloses the claimed feature. Like Patel, Vange discloses a system whereby a gateway provides clients access to the Internet [Patel, Figure 1 & Vange, Figure 2]. Vange discloses a load balancing service that dispatches requests to an application server in a plurality of application servers, based on said quality of service context [0094 | Vange's claim 1 : where the gateway load balances by "selecting amongst servers of redundant resources a particular server"]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Patel to include Vange's load balancing capability. One would have been motivated to add such a feature into Patel to insure that loads are balanced equally between the servers.

23. As to claims 17 and 26, they are merely directed to a system that performs the steps of the method of claim 8. Therefore claims 17 and 26 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 8.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOHM CHANKONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday [8:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571.272.3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dohm Chankong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452